

# The Church and Peace



"Catholic" or "Roman Catholic"?

## The Catholic Mind

SEMI-MONTHLY

Price 5 cents; \$1.00 per year

Entered as second-class matter, October 22, 1914, at the Post Office at  
New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

*Vol. XV, No. 23. December 8, 1917*

THE AMERICA PRESS

173 East 83d Street

NEW YORK

# THE CATHOLIC MIND

## 1903

- What the Church has Done for Education.*  
John Conway

## 1906

- The Delusion of Christian Science.*  
T. J. Campbell

## 1912

13. *The Religious Teacher.* M. J. O'Connor  
17. *The People's Pope.* Michael Kenny

## 1913

5. *Capital Punishment.* John J. Ford  
16. *Catholicism and Americanism.*

## 1914

15. *Freemasonry and Catholicism in America.* Michael Kenny  
16. *Divorce.* Hon. Joseph E. Ransdell  
19. *Justice to Mexico.*  
21. *The Needy Family and Institutions.* R. H. Tierney  
22. *The Architect's Plan.* John A. Cotter  
23. *Mexican Liberalism.* A. de F.  
24. *First Encyclical of Benedict XV.*

## 1915

1. *The Catholic Press.* E. Hull  
2. *The "Menace" and the Mails.* Paul Bakewell  
3. *The Ethics of War.* Edward Masterson  
5. *The Jesuit Myth.* Robert Swickerath  
12. *The Church and the Sex Problem.* R. H. Tierney  
13. *The War's Lesson.* Rt. Rev. Thomas O'Dwyer, D.D.  
14. *Catholic Schools for Catholic Youths.* Most Rev. John Ireland  
17. *The Church and the Immigrant.* Rt. Rev. Francis C. Kelley, D.D.  
18. *The Contemporary Drama.* James J. Daly  
22. *Mexico's Social Problem.* A Mexican Lawyer  
24. *Reading and Character.* James J. Daly

## 1916

1. *Catholics and Frank Statement.* Ernest R. Hull  
4. *The Ethics of Journalism.* Thomas F. Woodlock  
6. *South America's Catholicism.* Walter Dwight  
7. *Maeterlinck's Philosophy of Life.* Condé Benoist Pallen, LL.D.  
8. *The Catholic Sense.* William Power

14. *The Causes of National Success.* Denis Lynch  
15. *The Catholic School System.* George Thompson  
16. *Dangers of Secular Universities.* F. L.  
17. *Father Rodriguez's Tercentenary.* George O'Neill  
18. *Pseudo-Scientists vs. Catholics.* F. L.  
19. *An Eighteenth-Century Social Work.* Henri Fouqueray  
20. *Race Suicide.* M. P. Dowling

## 1917

1. *The Church and Science.* Thomas Dwight, M.D., LL.D.  
2. *Canada's Language Controversy.* Papal Encyclical  
3. *Mexico's "National Church."* Rt. Rev. Ignatio Valdespino  
4. *How Catholic Colleges Exist.* Henry S. Spalding  
6. *Study Centers for Work-Folk.* A. Leleu  
7. *Governor Catts' Delusions.* Francis J. Sullivan  
*The Catholic Church and Billy Sunday.* J. Harding Fisher  
8. *Christianity and the War.* Rt. Rev. John P. Carroll, D.D.  
9. *The "Unbiased" "Independent."* Thomas F. Woodlock  
10. *The Persecutors' Constitution.* The Mexican Hierarchy  
*The Catholic's Duty in War-Time.* Patrick H. Casey  
11. *Religious Bigotry in Action.* Stephen H. Horgan  
*Modesty in Dress.* Mrs. O'Nolan  
13. *The Mixed-Marriage Problem.* Frank H. Spearman  
14. *American Catholic History and Religion.* Richard H. Tierney  
15. *A Catholic Soldier's Diary.* Giosuè Borsi  
16. *Popular Errors About Classical Studies.* Thomas E. Murphy  
17. *The Pope's Letter on Preaching.*  
18. *The Ultimate Aim of Education.* D. Mageean  
19. *The Chaplain's Duties.* George L. Waring, U. S. A.  
*What Fight Ye For?* Rt. Rev. James E. Cassidy, V.G.  
20. *Joan of Arc's "Catholic Persecutors."* Terence L. Connolly  
21. *The Evil of Drunkenness.* J. Harding Fisher  
22. *The Ethics of the Ouida-Board.* James F. Barrett

Single numbers 5 cents each, \$4.00 per hundred.

Bind Your Copies of the Catholic Mind; "Little Ben Binder" Only 60c Postpaid

THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 EAST 83D STREET, NEW YORK.

## The Church and Peace

MOST REV. EDWARD J. HANNA, D.D., ARCHBISHOP OF  
SAN FRANCISCO.

*A Sermon Preached at the Sixteenth Annual Convention  
of the American Federation of Catholic  
Societies, Kansas City, Mo., on  
August 26, 1917.*

IN one of the most momentous crises in the history of civilization, we gather here in the shadow of the Tabernacle, bearers of the light which is in Christ, unto the men of this generation, chosen representatives of the Church of the Living God. Though we are not the authoritative mouthpiece of the great Catholic body, still the personal representative of the Vicar of Jesus Christ honors us with his gracious presence, and lends the dignity of highest authority to our deliberations; a Prince of Holy Church has crossed a continent to give us the aid of his most wise counsel, the help of his great name. Many are here who have inherited the power of the Apostles, and many more, their colaborers, who, as the torch-bearers of old, hand down the message of Christ unto those to whom they have been sent.

We therefore represent the old Faith in a way all our own, and to us the Faithful look for steady guidance, to us the Faithful look for encouragement and for assurance, in these days of change, in these days of danger, of darkness and of doubt, while to those outside the Fold we ought to be the bearers of a message that for them and for the world is of serious import.

Nor may we refuse the task given to us, for never since the days of Christ has the need of Him been as crying as it is today, and never since the first days of Christianity did the Church have a mightier opportunity for good than the opportunity which falls to her lot in the present crisis of man's history.

Will you bear with me while I picture to you in broadest lines the world of today, and while I endeavor to show that in the Church alone is the wisdom, in the Church alone is the power, necessary for the healing of the nations, necessary, too, for the establishing of abiding peace.

It must be granted that for the past hundred years or more the men who have ruled the destinies of the world, the kings and the men of science, have risen up against God and against His Church. Back of every movement as wide and as great as is this apostasy, there must be a distinct philosophy. Nor is it difficult to trace this philosophy even to its source. Men broke away from the authority of the Church in the days of the Reformation, and proclaimed private judgment even in the interpretation of the counsels of God revealed unto men for man's salvation. Following their own fancy, some wise men have regarded men as a plaything of fate, a pawn on the chessboard of the world, which the supermen to whom come the will to conquer and the might to rule, move about at their veriest pleasure. Others have seen man advancing to perfection by a gradual unfolding of his powers, and the evolution by which man grows unto the ideal is accomplished by a ruthless untiring struggle in which only the fittest survive. Nor are the fittest the higher, finer intellectual types of mankind, but those who in the contest have cast aside the higher

moralties which ought ever to determine action, and place their belief in the gospel of right by might.

True, there has been in all these years an attempt on the other side, an attempt to make a god of man, an attempt to make humanity worshipful, and thus the crude, merciless philosophy of evolution was softened somewhat by the cult of Positivism. There is no God, there is no Christ, there is no future of which man may be sure, for these things transcend human knowledge, but man is great and noble, man must strive to realize the great ideal which is within himself, an ideal which the Christian dispensation with all its conquest and with all its glory has helped man to attain.

These men grant the power and the office of the Christian Church, but they say that her function has passed, her task is at an end, and now with science as queen must begin the new era of progress unto higher ideals, a new era of liberty of spirit, a new era of a higher recognition of human rights, a new era of democracy, a new era in which man will attain peace from the love and from the realization of the ideals within him.

The philosophy of the past century has not taken into consideration the place of Christ nor the place of His Church in the government of the world. Nay more, the kingdoms of the earth have been warring almost continually with the Papacy, with the representative of the Christ-ideal upon earth. In the working out of the great evolutionary philosophy, nations have formed their own ideals of national greatness, and on immense standing armies have they relied to avert peril from peoples of hostile intent, by immense armies have they sought to impose their will, and consequently their ideals, upon their weaker brethren. And all the while they have pro-

claimed their love for the finer things of life, their love for the arts of peace.

The men who really understood felt that such conditions could not long endure, and that finally must come the test of strength, finally must dawn the day when the attempt would be made to impose the philosophy of might upon the world. The men who really understood knew, too, that in the day of contest the world, still influenced by the teaching of Christ, would rise in its strength to avenge the insults heaped upon human dignity, to assert the most sacred rights of conscience, to proclaim the loftier hopes of men.

In one night the storm broke, in one night the world awoke to the horror of an earth-wide struggle, and the fond vision treasured of men vanished, the vision of progress, of liberty, of brotherly love, of democracy, of abiding peace. Instead of progress there was a return unto barbarism, instead of liberty and democracy, there was martial law with its iron rule, instead of brotherhood there came the fiercest race-hatred that earth has ever known, instead of peace, the roar of cannon and the clash of arms.

We had hoped that the wave of blood might not reach our peaceful shore, but those who guide the destinies of our great nation have decreed that in this struggle there is a question of human rights so appealing, a question of human dignity and of human liberty so sacred, a question of national safety so imperative, that we may not stand aside. Our Catholic leaders, emulating Carroll and Hughes of old, have placed themselves clearly on record, and with no feeling either of fear or of hate, we, shoulder to shoulder with our fellows, are today the mightiest factor in the world's great struggle.

After months of painful thought, we have come to our world-task, but we come not as men without hope. We take our place in the world's struggle with warmth of spirit because we feel that if we are true to our great spiritual inheritance, true to the inheritance which the past century rejected, we may bring the world again to a realization of Christ's wisdom, a realization of Christ's power, a realization that only in Christ and in His teaching can there be victory for human rights, only in Christ can victory bring enduring peace.

The struggle for human rights, the struggle for liberty and for democracy, is one of the most stirring tales in all our world-history. This struggle recalls heroes in the great days of Greece, heroes who made famous the annals of Rome. This struggle recalls the thirteenth century and the revival of St. Francis and St. Dominic. This struggle recalls America's battles for right and for liberty, Washington, Lincoln and the great names of our honored time. But we cannot fully grasp this entrancing story, unless we understand that the foundations of our liberty and of our democracy are laid deep in the assertion of man's great dignity, in the realization of man's power to rule his fellow-men, man's power to determine the fitness of those who would be his masters, in the conviction that man grows into greatness of stature when great responsibilities are placed upon him, and above all things, we shall fail to appreciate freedom's tale till we understand that the foundations of our liberty lie deep in the willingness to sacrifice our own petty personal interests for the greater weal of the whole body politic, to sacrifice wealth and treasure, yea and the things that pass, for man's eternal interests, for truth and for justice which must ever remain. If you

would trace the story and the failure of the democracies that have come and have gone through the ages, you will find that liberty has ever been beset not only by ignorance but most of all by lust for possession, by love of ease and of luxury, by the craving there is in man for power over his fellows, and by the pressing need that there must always be in the poor for food and for shelter, which need makes the poor man of every age sell his birthright for the traditional mess of pottage, which need makes him heedless of the treasure he has cast aside.

This is the story of the Athenian democracy, this is the story of Rome's famed republic, this is the story of Venice, of the Florence of Savonarola, of Geneva, of Pisa; this is the story of the failure of so many efforts at self-government through the centuries. These same forces are at work in our time, and these same forces, ignorance and love of power, ease and love of possession, poverty in all its phases, are as telling in our day as they have been in the past. If government by the people perish not from the earth forever, there must be an antidote against the poison with which these things infect the body politic. There must be knowledge of man's great dignity and of man's power to upbuild and to rule. There must be a developed sense of man's responsibility for his own life and action, yea and for the lives and for the actions of others. There must be a clear conviction that the State rises into greatness more by the intelligence and by the righteousness of its citizens, more by their willingness to make sacrifices for a higher good, than by the possession of all the power and of all the treasure of earth, which though they win for men a passing mastery over their fellows, lead so often to a fatal



forgetfulness of God and to that selfishness, idleness and luxury which must ever destroy.

Man left to unaided reason has been able to know God, has been able to know in a measure the greatness of his own inborn dignity, has been able to know something of his ethical relations with his fellow-men, but this knowledge, history attests, has been vague, strangely sown with error, and above all things has been the possession of a privileged few. Only in that revelation that has its fullness in Christ does man see clearly that God is his Father, that God is the judge to whom he must render account of his life and of his deeds; only in Christ does this man see his own mighty place in creation, only in Christ does man understand that he is indeed God's image reflecting ever God's wisdom, God's love, God's beauty, God's power. Only in the revelation of God in the Face of Jesus Christ, does man know his place in God's economy, his untold worth measured by the Blood of a Man-God. "Thou hast made him a little less than the angels, Thou hast placed him over the works of Thy Hand." "Bought indeed at a great price." Only in Christ does man appreciate his inheritance, which is faith, his inheritance which is hope; only in Christ is the brotherhood of man brought home to him, only in Christ does he learn that every man has been loved by the Father with eternal love, every man has become verily a son of God in the mystery of the Incarnation. Only in Christ does man recognize the mystery of his own nothingness, only in Christ does he know that power is made perfect in infirmity, only in the kindlier light of the revelation of Jesus does man know and feel that he can do all things in Christ, only in the same clear light does he know how to value the things round

about him, only by Christ has he been led to seek first the kingdom of God, to seek first truth and justice and service and mercy, only in Christ does he know that the things that pass with him, gold and treasure and luxury and power, are nought in comparison with the wisdom that must remain forever. Only in Christ does man learn to subject his lower nature to reason enlightened by grace. Only in Christ does he learn that the highest law commands man to sacrifice himself, yea more, to lay down his life for his friend, his brother. And finally, only in Christ is the grace and the power to realize fully this ideal in our individual lives, though we are wont to acknowledge that the finer kind of man even outside the Fold, may see these things as in a glass darkly. Now these things are the foundations, the safeguards of our democracy.

Thus we, who in this mighty earth combat, fight upon the side of liberty and of democracy, bring to our task a knowledge and a discipline which others may not bring, bring to our work a feeling of responsibility, a willingness to sacrifice, a sense of solidarity, a standard of values, which must ever be a guaranty that democracy and freedom will not perish from the earth, must ever be preservatives against the corruption which has ever been destructive of human rights and of human liberty. These truths taught so clearly by Christ represent the case of liberty and of democracy and of a consequence it behooves us as Catholics and as patriots to be true to these lofty ideals, it behooves us to be willing to take upon ourselves the responsibility which Christ imposes, it behooves us to recognize the glory of government by the people, when exercised aright, it behooves us to make every sacrifice which the bond of brother-

hood exacts, and finally it behooves us to forego if necessary, pleasure and power and wealth and comfort that justice and truth may be triumphant. Then with our millions working as one man, we shall give glory to the Father, we shall be an honor to the Catholic name, we shall be the truest upholders in the land of that freedom which has been entrusted us by our fathers, of that freedom for which they bled and died.

In the battle-line where we fight for the rights of man, rights which man may not forego, the knowledge which is in Christ points the way, the power which is in Christ must lead to victory. But the purpose of war is peace, and men engage in just war to the end that peace may come, enduring peace. In God's own time, peace must come to our embattled earth, and when carnage is no more and peace enfolds the land, then will come the real test of strength, then will be seen the power of the truth we preach, the vindication of Christ and of His Church, then will be seen that only in Christ is the hope of democracy, then also will be seen that only in Christ, the Prince of Peace, only in following the truth He has taught, can there be permanence in the peace guaranteed by the compacts of the nations.

Go back if you will in spirit to the early days of the century. The kindly men of all the earth had been seeing in vision a race so perfect, a brotherhood so recognized, a refinement so esthetic, that they felt that war must cease. These kindly men were not content with theory, they made propaganda among the nations, they approached the kings, the princes, the rulers of earth, to urge upon them the necessity of international agreements by which armament might be lessened, the horrors of war softened, the rights of smaller nations

guaranteed and permanent peace be finally established. The representatives of all the great powers of earth met in a great assembly. Never before had men witnessed so imposing a gathering, never before had men felt a greater pride in the seeming solidarity of the race, never before had hope been larger, hope that war might cease. True to the philosophy which had marked the age, there was no place in this tribunal for Christ, no place for His Representative upon earth. Laws were made by this most august body, laws that would make it impossible for the nations to construe their rights in accord with the measure of their strength. Laws were made touching the things which must in the end make for cessation of war, and these laws were solemnly approved by the most imposing representative assembly that earth has ever known. Eight years ran on, in which the world heard nothing save war and rumors of war. Armaments had grown apace, horrors were brought into warfare which even a savage never conceived. Science was using all its great power to increase cruelty and pain. The rights guaranteed to smaller nations were disregarded, and war came, so staggering in its dimensions that future generations will refuse to believe even its most common happenings. Again, it is the old story: the most sacred rights of man sacrificed to ignorance and to superstition, to man's lust for possession, to his craving for power—man's most sacred rights disregarded because men will love ease and luxury and comfort, because men will not make sacrifices for their brothers, because the poor must eat else they die. In the light of this peace-story, what do we learn? We learn that there is no security in the mere bargaining of the nations, there is no peace save where the moral

law imposes its dread majesty, its more dread sanctions. In the light of this peace-story, we learn that there will be no end to war's horrors until men recognize that there is a God in heaven to whose behests they must yield, whose will they must obey, before whose sovereignty they must bow in all humility, before whose judgment they must stand. There will be no end to war until men renew their allegiance unto the Prince of Peace, until men feel that Christ is the central figure of earth and that he must reign until He puts His enemy under His footstool. There will be no peace until men enlightened of Christ understand man's great place in nature, man's dignity in the Christian dispensation, until kings and princes feel that they may not trifle with the lives and the liberties of their subjects, may not abuse their holiest rights to forward unholy ambitions; there will be no tranquillity in the ordering of the world until men moved by Christ's spirit put their trust not in power, not in gold, not in the possession of many things, but in God, the Father, and in the truth and in the direction He has revealed in Jesus Christ.

There will be neither freedom nor peace until men are willing to sacrifice even of life that they may serve the greater good of mankind. There will be no permanent abiding concord of princes and of rulers until the men who sway the destinies of nations recognize the great moral sanctions of life, recognize that the human being is more valuable than all earth's possessions, recognize that mercy must season justice, recognize the higher code taught by Christ, in accordance with which men are ruled by moral force, recognize yea and listen, as the Ages of Faith listened, to him who, in the ways of Providence, represents Christ upon earth,

and who by his very place in the world's economy is by Divine appointment "mediator of peace."

I have spoken, venerable brethren, in behalf of human liberty, in behalf of democracy. I have spoken in behalf of enduring peace, and I hold that only in the Catholic Church can men find the teachings which will lay deep the foundations of the rule of the people, only in the Catholic Church will men find the discipline and the virtue which can make a democracy lasting. I hold, too, that only in the great moral sanctions of the Church is there hope of abiding peace, only in the ways of the Church can be verified the conditions that are necessary to establish and to maintain permanent tranquillity in our troubled world.

We meet here, the guests of a gracious host, the guests of a great Catholic people. We meet here the representatives of men banded together for the furtherance of the cause of Jesus Christ. We meet here under the leadership of the men whom the Holy Ghost has set apart to rule the Church of God. We meet at a time when the future of the world's civilization is in the balance, and when we as Catholics have a great task to perform, when we as Catholics have the mightiest chance given us down the ages. Oh, may we be worthy of the great trust placed in us, worthy of our native land, worthy of our Christian inheritance, worthy of our Catholic name!

The age in which we live is an age of vast organization, and never before did men feel as they do in our time that in closest union there is greatest strength. Under your new plan of federation, you will gather your millions into serried array, until they present to the world the imposing spectacle of a Catholicism united as

it was never united before; under the inspiration of your leaders you will catch the spirit of Christ, His spirit of love, His spirit of tolerance, His spirit of fearlessness, where there is a question of right, His willingness to die that truth and justice may conquer, that men may be saved. Sitting at the feet of your Christian teachers you will learn the whole counsel of God as revealed in Jesus Christ, and armed with knowledge and with piety you will take your place in the battle-ranks of the soldiers of Jesus Christ, you will fight for the higher things of the spirit. You will strive that honor and justice may triumph over greed and over lust for power; you will battle that moral force may take the place of the material force of arms; you will uphold the standard of values revealed by Jesus Christ, a standard that puts the rights of men, the triumph of justice, the glory that is to come, above that selfish ambition that finds contentment in the things of earth; you will march with your brothers to conquest and to earthly victory, while you keep your eyes fixed upon heaven and the beauty and the splendor, which pass understanding. You will make every man your brother in Jesus Christ, and in the mighty union of the children of earth, beneath the banner of the Man-God, you will bring in the reign of love, you will begin the reign of peace.

**"Catholic" or "Roman Catholic"?**

ERNEST R. HULL, S.J.

*From the "Bombay Examiner"*

**I**N connection with the recent discussion of the Pope's peace-terms, the Rev. Harold F. Davidson, Chaplain of the Royal Navy, etc., published in the *Times of India*, September 3, a reply to a letter of August 28, signed "A Catholic." Were it not that our hands are full just now with our commentary on *Historicus*, we should gladly join issue with that gentleman on quite a number of points which his letter contains. But leaving that task to those immediately engaged in the controversy, we confine ourselves to the peroration of the Rev. Davidson's letter, which runs as follows:

Finally, I must protest most emphatically against the use by your correspondent in the middle of his letter of the word "Catholics" when he means "Roman Catholics." I claim myself to be a Catholic as a member of the Anglican Branch of the Universal Church of Christ. Members of the Greek Church are Catholics. I strongly resent this exclusive claim to catholicity constantly implied in the use of this word without the qualifying adjective by members of a Branch of the Church which has narrowed itself down the ages by its reiterated attempts to define the indefinable, and by its arrogant exclusive claims has cut itself off from the rest of Christendom and is therefore by its own act in a state of schism. I would earnestly beg your correspondent to remember that the word "Catholics" applies to the members of other branches of the Universal Church besides his own, and would also urge him, if he feels so uncertain of his attitude that he dare not sign his name to what he writes, at any rate in future to adopt a more correct form of anonymity and sign himself "A Roman Catholic."



While never shirking a plain statement of our principles regarding the Anglican position as often as occasion has required it, our general practice has been to leave the Anglican Church alone, especially considering the prevailing tone of good feeling and courtesy which dominates the relation of the Anglican clergy to our missionaries in this country, the exceptions to which, though sometimes emphatic, are at least individual and incidental. We have had personal dealings with a certain number of the "Highest of the High" and have listened to their way of talking in the "Catholic manner," without in any way assenting thereto, but at the same time without marring the cordiality and courtesy of our relations to men for whose personal earnestness we were forced to entertain the highest esteem. But when a member of that communion comes forward in the public press, with a blatant manifesto and challenge such as that quoted above, we feel that all truce must be at an end, with such a representative at least; and we hope that those quiet and modest members of the same communion who may read the following comment will realize that it is fully provoked and justified.

In connection with the term "Catholic" two totally different discussions arise, which we must handle separately. The first is the theological question, while the second is one of linguistic usage merely.

The theological question comes to this: "Whether the Anglican Church is either wholly or in part the Catholic Church." To this question we can give only one answer. We say that the Catholic Church is essentially one united body under the headship of the Successor of St. Peter; and whatever portion of Christendom is separated therefrom is no longer the Catholic Church or

any part of it. This is our basic position, from which we cannot possibly budge an inch. We view as separated from the Catholic Church not only the Anglican, but also the Greek and other Eastern bodies which are out of communion with Rome. "*Ubi Petrus, ibi Ecclesia.*"

Of course this contention of ours has always been denied by these different separatists. The Nestorians in rejecting Ephesus, the Eutychians in rejecting Chalcedon, the Byzantines in breaking communion with the Pope, all took for granted that they remained the true Church. Nay, more, as soon as they formulated their views on the point, they maintained that it was the Church of Rome that had gone wrong and so had ceased to be the Church of Christ, while they remained the *only* one true Church. As to the churches which were formed at the Reformation, their attitude on this question was different. They weakened the conception of the Church as a visible communion, and elevated in its place the idea of the Church invisible, consisting of all the "elect" who held the true allegiance to Christ within their souls. This view seems to be the dominating one among the Lutherans, Presbyterians and Dissenters. The Anglican Church took a middle course; or rather, it embraced within itself two types of mentality. The Low Anglicans took the "invisible-church" view to a great extent, and seemed to regard ecclesiastical organization as little more than a convenient traditional way of maintaining fellowship and public order. Side by side with these there was always among Anglicans a certain number who, with greater theological acumen, adhered to the idea of the visible hierarchical Church as essential and fundamental, but went in for local autonomy and the right of self-reformation. They did not abandon

the idea of their being still the Catholic Church, nor did they deny the Church of Rome to be another part. They contended however that particular churches could err and had erred, and that Rome was amongst them; and that the Church of England, instead of losing its prerogatives, had brightened them up, and emancipated itself from error. It is on this basis that the branch theory of the Church was reared. But the High Church divines were always a minority among Anglicans, and the great bulk of that communion was, and still is, frankly Protestant. They still, if asked, would say that their Church is a true Church in the sense that it preserves true doctrine and true sacraments; but that is about as far as they would go.

The modern High Church party, owing its origin to the Tractarian movement, though relatively small in numbers, are always increasing both in adherents and in activity. They have done their best to assimilate everything which was rejected at the Reformation, except the supremacy of the Pope and one or two other recondite points, and try to justify their isolation in Christendom by the branch theory of the Church. In order to give this theory a respectable appearance they are obliged to include the Eastern churches, although all the Eastern churches except one are vitiated by heresies condemned by the whole Church in the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon. As to the Byzantine Church, they have a more plausible ground in the fact that its cause of separation from Rome was schismatical not dogmatical; that is to say, a refusal to acknowledge the primacy of the Pope, which the Anglicans also deny.

By this expedient they can get together at least three well-defined churches to form the triple branches of the

vine: the Roman, the Anglican and the Byzantine. Each of these branches, they admit, may have its imperfections; the Roman Church claims too much for the Pope, the Greek Church is both superstitious and stagnant, the Anglican Church is too comprehensive and tolerant, and so on. But these defects do not destroy the Catholic character of the churches, as they merely touch the *bene esse* not the *esse* of the mystical body of Christ.

Such is the convenient theory by which the Anglican High Church justifies its existence and its claims to be part of the true Church. But it is useless making claims which no one else but the claimant will acknowledge. I might get up on a pole and shout that I was Viceroy of India, and feel fully convinced of the truth of my claim; but what if nobody seconded the motion?

This is just the position of the High Anglicans with their claims to be a branch of the Church Catholic. Rome absolutely denies the claim; so does Byzantium; so do the Monophysite churches; so do the Nestorians. Even their fellow-religionists of Reformation origin either deny their claim or acknowledge it in a sense which Anglicans themselves would repudiate. The Lutherans, the Presbyterians, the Nonconformists, even the vast majority of the members of the Church of England itself, reject the High Anglican pretension, and would say emphatically: "In whatever sense you are a part of the Church of Christ, we are also parts of the Church of Christ. Nay, we are if anything truer parts, because our teaching is more pure than yours." And yet the High Church Anglicans deny that "Protestants" of any kind are part of the Church Catholic, and refuse to include them among the branches.

The Anglican High Church party therefore stands isolated like a voice crying in the wilderness. It is the story of the Donatists over again, who set up their insignificant sect in a corner of Africa and declared themselves to be exclusively the Catholic Church, while the whole world said the contrary. "*Securus judicat orbis terrarum*," exclaimed St. Augustine; and by this argument he brought the Donatist schism to an end. Well may we say now against the High Anglicans: "*Securus judicat orbis terrarum*," which is unanimous in rejecting the branch theory on which their existence as a Church depends.

This isolation is naturally exasperating to the High Anglicans. Hence their great assiduity to propagate among their own followers the practice of making a bold profession of their claims, in the hope that by persevering repetition people may get at least a slovenly habit of regarding it as true. One of their expedients for securing this end is to get themselves called "Catholics," and to insist as far as they can on calling us "Roman Catholics," as if we were not the only ones, and needed an adjective to distinguish us from them.

This brings us to the second point, namely, the use of language. With regard to the first part of this maneuver we have to remark as follows: If they sincerely believe that they are Catholics, no one in the world can prevent them from saying so, and adopting the name for themselves. Those who deny their contention will, of course, be either angry or amused according to their own attitude of mind; and the general public can quite fairly decline to call them Catholics if they think the name is wrong.

Where a certain name has been in vogue from time

immemorial, and has secured its place in a language, it would sometimes, or perhaps always, be wanting in courtesy to refuse that name, because the refusal would be "going out of one's way." Thus Catholics always speak of the Anglican "Archbishop of Canterbury," though they absolutely deny that he is an archbishop at all. The acceptance of the term is not a compromise of principle, because it is merely a falling in with the conventionalities of language. In the same way we accept the term of "Christian Scientist" although we deny altogether that the system so-called is either Christian or Science. But when it comes to calling High Anglicans "Catholics," we have to deal with a totally different case; namely, a deliberate conspiracy to revolutionize the standards of the English tongue. It is true that some High Anglican writers in different centuries can be quoted who claimed for their Church the title of Catholic; and it is also true that every Sunday Anglicans recite the Nicene Creed which expresses belief in the "One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church." But when we come out of the sanctuary into the street, and are confronted with the names which people bear in the street, we can declare without fear of contradiction that the universal usage of the English language, ever since the Reformation was established, has been to call members of the Church of England "Protestants." This is what they habitually called themselves; and this is, moreover, what they are called and call themselves now except among the High Church clique itself.

The adoption of the noun "Catholic" by them is of altogether recent origin. It has come into existence among High Anglicans merely as a sequel of the Tractarian movement, and the revival of the idea of Catho-

licism which that movement inaugurated; and it is only in quite recent years, say the last twenty-five or thirty, that the term Catholic has come into vogue even in their own narrow circle. Since therefore it is altogether an upstart claim in nomenclature, no one can be accused even of uncivility if he keeps up the tradition of three centuries, and perseveres in calling Anglicans Protestants and refuses to call them Catholics.\* Until a fresh linguistic usage has established itself among English-speaking peoples in general, the word Catholic, as adopted by them, remains a campaign-word involving a theological principle; and therefore those who deny the theological connotation it contains are bound to abstain from its use.

Thus far for the High Anglican conspiracy to secure the recognition of the term "Catholic" for themselves. So long as they stop there, they can at least be credited with an honest endeavor to objectivize their own views about themselves. But when it comes to trying to bully us out of the use of the word "Catholic" for ourselves and into the use of "Roman Catholic" instead, they are really going too far, even to the verge of impudence.

Synchronous with the traditional English usage of designating all Christians separated from Rome by the Reformation as "Protestants," there has existed the equally universal usage of calling the adherents of Rome "Catholics." The term "Roman Catholic" has been also in

---

\*In dealing *personally* with High Anglicans we should abstain from calling them Protestants, because they are strenuous Protestants against Protestantism in all its essential principles as popularly understood. But this does not stand in the way of our contention that calling Anglicans Protestants is strictly according to the traditional use of the language, and therefore cannot be objected to on general grounds of linguistic right.

vogue especially in recent times in military and other official circles. But in general parlance "Roman Catholic," though freely used, has always been a pleonasm. Everybody could and did use simply "Catholic" without the least chance of being misunderstood. This usage is stamped not only on the spoken but equally on the written tongue. Historians, controversialists, travelers and literateurs have all taken it for granted; and a *catena* could be drawn up from the reign of James I to the present day, from which probably no single author who refers to us at all would have to be omitted.

Taking up Webster's Dictionary, even as late as the 1880 edition, we find the word "Catholic" treated as an adjective and as a noun: As an *adjective* he gives the following meanings:

- (1) Universal or general; as the *Catholic faith*.

*Note.*—This epithet is rightly applied to the whole Christian Church, though it has been claimed exclusively by the Church of Rome to which it is often limited.

- (2) Not narrow-minded, partial or bigoted; liberal, as *Catholic tastes*.

- (3) Pertaining to or affecting the Roman Catholic Church, as *Catholic emancipation*.

But when he comes to the *noun* he gives one single meaning "Catholic = an adherent of the Roman Catholic Church." A dictionary is not a law but a record. It does not create linguistic usage but reflects it; and I doubt whether you could find a neater witness to the soundness of our contention than this.

It is quite possible that as the High Anglican campaign progresses, the application of the term Catholic to them may secure sufficient vogue to find its place in new editions of dictionaries and it may have found its



place in some already for all I know. But the fact remains that the editors of Webster in the year 1880 knew of no other meaning for the word "Catholic," as a noun, than a member of the Roman Catholic Church. This, moreover, is one's common experience even nowadays. Except when dealing with inspired and instructed High Anglicans, the statement: "I am a Catholic" can only be understood to mean a subject of the Pope, a member of the Church of Rome; and if anyone claiming this term is found out afterwards to be a member of the Church of England, the impression is that he has spoken under false pretences.

Thus *Webster*, as a witness to the standard English usage down to 1880, substantiates three points: (1) The word Catholic, used alone as a noun, is not an ambiguous term; (2) It definitely means a member of the Roman Church; (3) It definitely does *not* mean a member of the Church of England.

Hence it follows that according to standard English we have a perfect right to call ourselves Catholics *simpliciter*; while High Anglicans cannot call themselves Catholics *simpliciter* without a departure in language, without attaching a new and unrecognized sense to the term.

My argument is likewise supported by Murray's "New English Dictionary."

(A) Taking "Catholic" as an *adjective*, No. A. 6, gives the following:

As an epithet, applied to the Ancient Church, as it existed undivided, prior to the separation of East and West, and of a church or churches standing in historical continuity therewith, and claiming to be identical with it in doctrine, discipline, orders, and sacraments. (a) After the separation, assumed by

the Western or Latin Church, and so commonly applied historically. (b) After the Reformation in the 16th century, claimed as its executive title by that part of the Western Church which remained under the Roman obedience; but (c) held by Anglicans not to be so limited, but to include the Church of England, as the proper continuation in England, alike of the Ancient and the Western Church.

(B) "Catholic" as a *noun* is defined thus:

1. A member of a Church recognized or claiming to be "Catholic" in sense A. 6; *e. g.* an Orthodox member of the Church before the disruption of East and West, as opposed to an Arian or other "heretic"; of the Latin Church as opposed to the Greek or any separating sect or community (*e. g.* the Lollards); of a church or churches now taken to represent the primitive Church.

2. *Specifically* a member of the Roman Church.

3. Defined or limited by a word prefixed, as *English Catholic*, *Popish Catholic*, *Anglo-Catholic*, *Roman Catholic*, q. v.

(C) Looking up the cross-reference to "Roman Catholic" we get the following:

The use of this composite term (Roman Catholic) in place of the simple *Roman*, *Romanist*, or *Romish*, which had acquired an invidious sense, appears to have arisen in the early years of the 17th century. For conciliatory reasons it was employed in the negotiations connected with the Spanish Match (1618-24), and appears in formal documents relating to this, printed by Rushworth (1659), I. 83-89. After that date it was generally adopted as a non-controversial term, and has long been the recognized legal and official designation, though in ordinary use *Catholic* alone is very frequently employed.

We see from this that Murray, though he takes a specific notice of the Anglican claim to Catholicism, still gives to the noun "Catholic," as used alone, the specific meaning "a member of the Roman Church"; adding that "in ordinary use Catholic alone is very frequently

employed." This gives once more a complete justification on linguistic grounds for us to call ourselves "Catholics" *simpliciter*; and therefore no one has the least right to quarrel with us for not prefixing the adjective "Roman." On the other hand, while Murray clearly recognizes the theological claim of the Anglican Church to the adjective "Catholic," he does not specifically countenance the claim of Anglicans to use the noun "Catholic" *simpliciter* for themselves. In other words, their calling themselves "Catholics" without qualification is an innovation in language which had not at the time of publishing that fasciculus (about 1893, or fourteen years ago) come into sufficient vogue to claim a place in the dictionary.

The remaining question is this. Have they a right to make such a departure; and if so, have they a right to force it on others? As a general principle it can be laid down that anybody has a perfect right to coin a new word in a language, so long as it is clear what he means by it. But he has no right to impose that new word on others. If the word is an apt one, people will only be too ready to adopt it and make it their own; if not, they will ignore it and refuse to accept it into general circulation.

Similarly, any person has a certain right to use an old word in a new sense, *provided he does not create confusion thereby*; but he cannot force others to adopt that new sense, or complain of ill-treatment or want of courtesy if it is not accepted.

Applying these principles, we say frankly that if High Anglicans are sincerely convinced that they are Catholics—though we are convinced that they are not—they have *subjectively* a perfect right to call themselves Cath-

olics so long as they do not thereby mislead the public. But this is just what they do. The public are accustomed from time immemorial to understand by the noun Catholic a member of the Church of Rome and not a member of the Church of England. And in spite of their energetic propaganda, this idea still stands rooted in the mind of the generality; so that the use of Catholic for a member of the Church of England is positively misleading.

If they were to adopt the term "Anglican Catholic" this linguistic objection would be to a great extent removed. But this is just what they avoid doing. From the outset they say "I am a Catholic"; and only when cornered by some such question as: "Do you obey the Pope?" will they bring out the distinction: "I am not a *Roman* Catholic but an *Anglican* Catholic."

If the High Anglicans were to propose: "Let us call ourselves 'Anglican Catholics' and let members of the Church of Rome call themselves 'Roman Catholics'," there would be at least a certain kind of impartiality in the suggestion. But they go further than this. While claiming for themselves the right to call themselves "Catholics" *simpliciter* they blatantly refuse to us the same right. "We Anglicans claim to call ourselves 'Catholics' *simpliciter*, but you must call yourselves 'Roman Catholics' "!

This is grossly one-sided. If Anglicans can call themselves "Catholics" *simpliciter* "as members of the Anglican branch of the Universal Church," and if members of the Greek Church can be called "Catholics" *simpliciter* as members of the Greek branch of the Universal Church, surely we can also call ourselves Catholics *simpliciter* as members of the Roman branch of the

same Universal Church. Hence the demand of the Rev Harold Davidson, that the correspondent signing himself "A Catholic" "should adopt a more correct form of anonymity and sign himself 'A Roman Catholic'" can only be described as unmitigated arrogance on the part of this high-handed and dogmatical Anglican clergyman.

But this is assuming an equal footing which does not exist. One of our people signing himself "A Catholic" is acting in conformity with the traditional usage of the English language for the last three-hundred years; whereas a High Anglican signing himself "A Catholic" would be following a new-fangled linguistic invention of quite recent date, which has not yet secured recognition outside his own small section of even the Anglican communion itself.

### **Our Country, First and Always**

**E**NGLISH and Scotch, German and Irish, French and Italian, Greek and Russian, were our forefathers who sought in this country the opportunities which persecution and political turmoil had denied them in the motherland.

Today, whatever strains may mingle in our veins, at whatever altars we may worship, we admit but one political allegiance. We are not Irish, not German, not English. We are Americans.

Not for a moment can we forget the country that has given us birth, on whose benign shores the oppressed of all nations have found a secure refuge, under whose fostering and watchful care we have lived as men should live, free and untrammelled in our right to life,

liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. May our hands fall palsied to our recreant sides, and our tongues cleave inarticulate to our traitorous palates, if in our regard for any other nation under heaven, we slacken even in our most secret thought, in our love and our devotion to the great nation which has endowed us with civic blessings beyond all price.

Today, calm and unafraid, our country girds herself in her mighty strength, as she goes forth to do battle that liberty may not perish from among the nations of the earth. Our prayers go with her, our hearts, our possessions, our lives. It is not ours to palter, to question, to temporize, or by cold calculation to chill the ardor with which this most just war has been undertaken. Our duty is to obey the orders of legitimate authority, as the bidding of Christ Himself from whom all power in heaven and on earth is rightfully derived.

We offer no hypocritical lip-service, no mechanical loyalty, but a devotion founded on our loyalty to God Himself, and we draw from that high loyalty the firm purpose to dedicate ourselves with all that we are and have to the service of our beloved country. That is the devotion which she rightly expects of us, and the devotion which every Catholic who is not basely recreant to the teachings of the Church will gladly give her.

# New Prices for These Books

## PIONEER PRIESTS OF NORTH AMERICA

By T. J. CAMPBELL, S.J.

Volume I

### Among the Iroquois

AN INTERESTING STORY OF THE MISSIONARIES AMONG THE IROQUOIS

333 Pages, 27 Illustrations

Price \$1.50, Postage extra

Volume II

### Among the Hurons

TELLS THE HEROIC STORY OF DE BRÉBEUF AND HIS ASSOCIATES

480 Pages, 24 Illustrations

Price \$1.50, Postage extra

Volume III

### Among the Algonquins

THE ETHNIC GROUP THAT FIGURED MORE THAN ANY OTHER INDIAN FAMILY

336 Pages, 22 Illustrations

Price \$1.50, Postage extra

All three volumes together for \$4.25

## PIONEER LAYMEN OF NORTH AMERICA

A New Historical Study by T. J. Campbell, S.J.

Telling the fascinating story of the adventurous Cartier, Menendez, Champlain, De La Tour, Maisonneuve, Le Moyne, Radisson, Le Moyne de Longueuil, Perrot, Le Moyne d'Iberville, Frontenac, La Salle, Le Moyne de Bienville, De La Vérendrye, and Dr. John McLoughlin.

Volume I, 300 Pages, 16 Illustrations. Price, \$1.75. Postage extra.

Volume II, 340 Pages, 14 Illustrations. Price, \$1.75. Postage extra.

These Two Splendid Volumes for \$3.00. Postage extra.

## LORETTO

Annals of the Century

A Book of Historical Interest

By ANNA C. MINOGUE

Introduction by the

Most Rev. John J. Glennon, D.D.

Archbishop of St. Louis

A fascinating narrative of the accomplishments of the pioneer Catholic women of Kentucky.

300 Pages, 21 Illustrations

Price 50c., Postage extra

LIFE AND LETTERS OF

## Henry Van Rensselaer

Priest of the Society of Jesus

By EDWARD P. SPILLANE, S.J.

Second Edition—Enlarged and Revised

Develops Father Van Rensselaer's public record, and gives a fuller presentation of his life in the priesthood.

350 pages, illustrated. Price 75c., Postage extra

## ISAAC JOGUES

DISCOVERER OF LAKE GEORGE

By T. J. CAMPBELL, S.J.

55 PAGES, 9 ILLUSTRATIONS.

Leatherette, 25c;

green silk cord, gilt

top, deckled edge, 50c;

édition de luxe, full

flexible green cowhide,

stamped with gold, gilt

top, deckled edge, \$1.00.

Postage extra.

## THE NAMES OF GOD

AND

Meditative Summaries of the Divine Perfection

By the Venerable Leonard Lessius, S.J.

Translated by T. J. CAMPBELL, S.J.

Although written three hundred years ago this book has never before been translated into English.

248 Pages, large type, with Portrait. Price 50c.

Postage extra.

Life of Venerable

Philippine Duchesne

Founder of the

American Mission

of the daughters

of the Sacred

Heart, one of the

intrepid pioneers

in the winning of

the West to the

Faith. Cloth.

25c. Postage extra

## Socialism

A Volume of Ten Excellent Essays by Foremost Catholic Writers. All Written in a Concise and Popular Style.

280 Pages

Of special service to those who are interested in the great issue of the day. Price 50c., Postage extra.

## What Luther Taught

The Latest and Best Pamphlet on the Subject

The country is now flooded with literature commemorating the four-hundredth anniversary

of Luther's rebellion. So every Catholic ought

to have at hand a brief and trustworthy guide.

Fathers Husslein and Reville, of the AMERICA

staff, have prepared from the very words of

Luther himself just the pamphlet you need.

Price 15 cents

\$10.00 a hundred

THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83rd Street, New York

Every Educated Catholic  
Should Subscribe for

# **AMERICA**

**A Catholic Review of the Week**

**The National Catholic Weekly**

**E**DITED by Fathers of the Society of Jesus, it chronicles the important events of the day throughout the world, discusses topics of current interest from the Catholic point of view, contains book reviews and has separate departments for education and sociology. Invaluable for priests, lawyers, doctors, teachers and professional men of every class.

---

**RICHARD H. TIERNEY, EDITOR-IN-CHIEF**

**ASSOCIATE EDITORS:**

**JOSEPH HUSSLEIN**

**J. HARDING FISHER**

**WALTER DWIGHT**

**JOHN C. REVILLE**

**PAUL L. BLAKELY**

---

**Sample copy on request**

**10 cents a copy; \$3.00 a year**

**Canada, \$3.50**

**Elsewhere, \$4.00**

---

**THE AMERICA PRESS**

**173 East 83d Street**

**New York**